DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 076 128 HE 004 091

AUTHOR	Keith, Nathan S., Jr.
TITLE	A Study of the Ph.D. Graduates of the University of Georgia 1966-1970.
INSTITUTION	Georgia Univ., Athens. Office of Program Planning and Analysis.
SPONS AGENCY	Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	[71]
NOTE	72p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Office of Program Planning and Analysis, White Avenue Building, Room 100, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30602
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Bibliographies; *Doctoral Programs; *Graduate Study; *Graduate Surveys; *Higher Education; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Research; Research Projects
IDENTIFIERS	*University of Georgia

ABSTRACT

This study attempts to obtain an evaluation of the graduate training of the University of Georgia Ph.D. graduates along with a measure of how well they have done since graduating from the University. Information was obtained by means of a questionnaire to the Ph.D. graduates who received their degree from the University between 1966-70. This survey concludes that the Ph.D. graduates are generally satisfied with their graduate training. A 35-item bibliography and appendices of related material are included. (Author/KJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 076128

A STUDY OF THE PH.D. GRADUATES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA 1966-1970

Nathan R. Keith, Jr.

PPBS Ford Foundation Project Grant No. 690 - 0660

HE 004 091

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PREFACE

The Office of Program Planning and Analysis supported by the Ford Foundation (Grant No. 690 - 0660) is developing for implementation an integrated system of Planning, Programming and Budgeting for the University of Georgia. Any such system by necessity must recognize environmental pressures upon the University, especially as such pressures concerns the outputs from the University -- its graduates.

The first of a series of alumni studies conducted by the Project Team is just being released. However, the Project Team in its prime endeavors is not only relying on its own capability but looks upon the University as a Resource Reservior to bring independent studies within the purposes of its particular project.

It has been fortunate that inspired by Professor W. L. Bashaw, Dr. Nathan R. Keith, Jr. completed a thesis presenting an important method of evaluating graduate output of the University of Georgia. This study is complementary to the first Alumni Study just released.

Dr. Nathan R. Keith has been good enough to re-edit his dissertation for release by the Office of Program Planning and Analysis which Office did not fund the dissertation research. However the staff of the Office of Program Planning and Analysis did offer constructive advice during the development of the dissertation. Thanks are extended to Dr. Ruth Eckert for allowing Dr. Keith to adapt the instrument, developed by Alciatore and Eckert at the University of Minnesota, for this study.

It is with pleasure that this Office does release the study for wide distribution.

A. A. Sterns
Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE. v

LIST OF TABLES ix

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION 1

The Problem. 2

Significance of the Problem. 3

Objectives 4

Assumptions. 5

Limitations. 5

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE 7

Follow-Up Studies of Doctoral Graduates. 7

Time to Get the Doctorate. 10

Improvement of Graduate Education. 10

Questionnaire Research 12

III. METHODOLOGY. 13

Instrument 13

IV. FINDINGS. 14

Sex Distribution and Major Distribution 14

Current Location of the Graduates 15

Current Academic Rank or Position 16

First Position After Receiving Doctorate. 17

Location of First Position After Doctorate. 17

Characteristics of Current Employment 19

Graduate School Satisfaction. 26

Page

Professional Affiliations. 34

Publications. 35

First Post Doctoral Position. 36

Characteristics of Graduate School. 38

Comparison with Related Research. 42

Written Responses. 43

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 46

Summary. 46

Conclusions. 50

Recommendations. 51

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 54

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire

APPENDIX B

Majors of University of Georgia Doctor of Philosophy Graduates, 1966-70

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1. Doctor of Philosophy Degrees Conferred 1966-70, The University of Georgia
2. Present State and Regional Distribution of Ph.D. Graduates
3. Current Academic and Non-Academic Rank of Graduates
4. First Position After Doctorate
5. Location of First Position After Doctorate
6. Current Place of Employment
7. Employment of Graduates by Type and Control of Institution
8. Full-Time Positions Held Since Graduation
9. Current Employment Status of Graduates
10. Distribution of Graduates by Type and Size of Institution
11. Salary Ranges for Current Position
12. Division of Actual Working Time in Present Position
13. Division of Desired Working Time in Present Position
14. Use of Skills and Abilities in Present Position
15. Skills and Abilities Acquired in Graduate School
16. Comparison of Use of Skills to Acquisition of Skills in Graduate School
17. Experiences of Graduates
18. Graduates Holding Active Membership in Professional Societies
19. Professional Honors Received Since Graduation
20. Sources for First Doctoral Position
21. Salary Range of First Doctoral Position
22. Years From Start on Doctorate to Receipt of Degree
23. Full-Time Equivalent Years Working Directly on Doctorate

Table

24. Years Between Receipt of Bachelor's Degree and Doctorate

25. Reasons for Attending Graduate School at the University of Georgia

26. Majors of University of Georgia Doctor of Philosophy Graduates, 1966-1970

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Systematic evaluations of the graduate and post-graduate experiences of doctoral graduates have not been generally published. A significant effort was that of Alciatore and Eckert (1968) at the University of Minnesota.

They stated that even though the strengths and weaknesses of graduate education have been debated since graduate education emerged at the doctoral level in the 19th century as a significant part of American education, little has been done to support the claim of the significance of graduate education. With the recent emphasis upon accountability of funds, graduate schools may be called upon to more fully justify their expenditures. Feedback from successful students, i.e., those receiving their Ph.D., is vital when trying to evaluate the effectiveness of the programs of the graduate schools. Not only should the graduate schools be aware of the information about and perceptions of its graduates, but individual departments should also be provided with this information.

Effectiveness of graduate education has, however, many dimensions. First of all, it can mean the impact on the chosen discipline itself, it can mean the capability of the degree recepient to increase his mobility from one discipline to another; it can mean his capability to apply the knowledge within the environment; it can mean return of investment in accordance with the human capital theory, etc. Such clarification of effectiveness of graduate programs becomes most important within a sys-

tem of Planning, Programming and Budgeting to which many educational institutions now have access.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of Doctor of Philosophy graduates from the University of Georgia. The questions asked of these graduates could very well be asked of the graduates of almost any Ph.D. granting institution in the country.

According to the Dean of the University of Georgia Graduate School, "the purpose of graduate education is to provide the opportunity, beyond the baccalaureate degree, for a student to obtain mastery of some field of knowledge. This may be done through formal courses, individual research, and/or independent study, under the direction of first-rate scholars in the field or fields of knowledge," Whitehead (1972). He further stated, "A graduate student receiving a graduate degree should have found out how to search the literature of his field, mastered the techniques of his field, and shown the ability to do independent work by study and/or research in his chosen field."

The Problem

The University of Georgia as indicated in Table 1, has conferred a total of 659 Doctor of Philosophy degrees, in the period 1960-1970. These degrees represent 33 major areas of study. Twenty-five times as many candidates received their Ph.D. in 1970 as did in 1960. Although there has been a steady growth in Ph.D.'s conferred each year since 1960, the vast majority of the degrees have been conferred from 1966 to 1970, about 77 percent.

This study describes the results of a survey of the Ph.D. graduates of the University of Georgia who received their Ph.D. in the period 1966-1970. Opinions from the graduates regarding their grad-

uate and post-graduate school experiences have been analyzed in order to have a better idea of the effectiveness of their graduate training. Since this study is considered as a basis for similar studies with stress on planning, some thought will be expressed later as to specification of format.

Table 1

Doctor of Philosophy Degrees Conferred 1960-70
The University of Georgia

Year	Ph.D's Conferred
1960	6
1961	7
1962	20
1963	33
1964	36
1965	45
1966	69
1967	83
1968	86
1969	123
1970	151
Total	659

Significance of the Problem

At the present time the Graduate School of the University of Georgia does not collect comprehensive information from its graduates. Information about the graduate and post-graduate successes and experiences of the Ph.D. graduates is virtually non-existent. The Ph.D.'s perceptions of the value of their graduate programs is one means of measuring the effectiveness of the programs of the Graduate School. By observing how well the graduates fare after leaving the University, the Graduate School has another way of

reviewing the effectiveness of its programs. With accurate information about its graduates, the Graduate School can measure with some reliability its own perceptions of the graduate program. With information available about the post-graduate success of its former graduates, the Graduate School will be in a position to compare certain characteristics of its graduates with those of other universities, e.g., the Minnesota Study. Since graduates are a product of the University of Georgia, information about graduates is vital when reviewing the output of the University.

Objectives

The main objective of this study is to obtain an evaluation of the graduate training of University of Georgia Ph.D. graduates along with a measure of how well they have done since graduating from the University. The technique used is potentially useful to most doctoral granting institutions. Information was collected and analyzed relative to the graduate and post-graduate experiences of the Ph.D. graduates of the University. Information was obtained by means of a questionnaire in the following areas:

(1) General biographical information,

(2) General satisfaction with the doctoral program,

(3) Suggestions for improving the doctoral program,

(4) Preparation for present position held, and

(5) Professional advancement since receiving the doctorate.

With accurate information about the five listed areas, the Graduate School can better assess its own perception of how well its graduates are prepared while in graduate school, and how well they are prepared for positions held after graduate school. If the Graduate School does, in fact, have misconceptions about its programs, then it is hoped that the results

of this study will help them gain a more accurate perception of the impact of their programs.

Assumptions

There are basic assumptions that must be made about this study before any reliability can be placed on the information collected. In any questionnaire survey, the following assumptions are usually made. It is reasonable to make these assumptions since the questionnaire has been tried out with usable results previously by Alciatore and Eckert (1968) and by Booth (1970). Four basic assumptions that must be accepted are:

(1) It must be assumed that the subjects of this study have answered the questionnaire as accurately and honestly as possible.

(2) It must be assumed that the subjects have interpreted each question in the same way.

(3) It must be assumed that the questions in the questionnaire are applicable to the subjects of the study.

(4) It must be assumed that those subjects residing in the United States would respond to a mailed questionnaire.

Limitations

Certain aspects of the design of this study set limitations on the generalizability of the results of the study. Since the subjects of this study are University of Georgia Ph.D. graduates who now reside in the United States, the results of this study can only be used to describe University graduates presently residing in the country. Although the methodology of this study can be used in most universities to evaluate part of their graduate program, the results of this particular study can-

not be used to infer characteristics of graduates of other graduate schools. The results cannot be used to generalize about all former Doctor of Philosophy graduates of the University. The lack of generalizability of the results to all previous Ph.D. graduates of the University is not expected to be a problem since the group being studied represents more than 50 percent of all Ph.D. graduates of the University prior to 1971.

CHAPTER II

SELECTED RELATED LITERATURE

It is quite obvious when reviewing the literature related to evaluation of graduate education that most graduate schools do not have substantial feedback about the satisfactions, or assessments of graduate training from their graduates. Since graduate schools are in a position where they must justify their continued growth, they must look upon a measure of their effectiveness to justify their programs. The effectiveness of the graduate school cannot be completely evaluated without measuring its end product, its graduates, and it appears obvious when reviewing the available literature that this has not been done very extensively.

Follow-Up Studies of Doctoral Graduates

Institutional research follow-up studies of doctoral graduates, though not forgotten, have not been thoroughly investigated. One study done by Aliciatore and Eckert (1968) studied the relationship between the Ph.D. program of the University of Minnesota graduates and later career service and satisfaction. They concluded that: (1) the graduate school was fulfilling its function of preparing research scholars, (2) the graduate school gave much less emphasis than needed for developing skills and abilities for teaching, (3) graduates want better preparation for college teaching, (4) efforts to provide candidates with preparation for later faculty service through an internship or through courses in higher education have met with substantial success, and (5) future internship programs are recommended.

In a study of doctoral graduates at the University of California at Berkeley, Heiss (1967) found that most doctoral graduates were satisfied with their overall doctoral experience. These students felt a need to personally identify with their program and to be able to integrate with the academic bloodstream of the university. The Berkeley doctoral students did indicate a need for a re-examination of the rationale on which some university requirements are predicated and for a re-evaluation of the appropriateness of these requirements to specific fields of knowledge.

Garrison (1951) conducted a follow-up study of doctoral graduates in education at the University of Missouri. Garrison analyzed his information under seven major categories: (1) basic biographical information, (2) education and training, (3) professional experience and development, (4) professional duties, activities, and responsibilities, (5) appraisal of their graduate program, (6) opinions on selected issues related to graduate work, and (7) summary, conclusions, and recommendations. He sampled all Ed.D. graduates from the University of Missouri. His results indicated general satisfaction with the graduate program in education at the University of Missouri, but the graduates indicated a need for more seminars, graduate assistantships, and placement services.

In 1970, a study of doctoral graduates in education was done by Booth (1970) at the University of Georgia. Booth had six precisely stated objectives in his study. These objectives were (1) to determine certain selected characteristics of each graduate, (2) to identify places of employment and types of positions held by the graduates, (3) to identify the skills and knowledge needed in these positions as perceived by the

graduates, (4) to determine the experiences that these graduates feel were helpful and that should be part of future graduate programs, (5) to identify experiences which graduates feel were not useful and should be changed in future years, and (6) to determine program deficiencies and strengths.

Booth gives a profile of Doctor of Education graduates within his summary and also states that the University of Georgia graduates have a generally positive attitude toward the University, its personnel, and their professional preparation. A conclusion that Booth reported, similar to that of Heiss (1967), was that the major factor affecting the attitude of the respondents toward their professional preparation was the type of contact with the faculty at the university where they studied for their degree. Booth reported that the most outstanding suggestion made by the graduates was that the program could be improved with more personal faculty contact and more interest in the student as an individual in planning the course of study.

Buswell, McConnell, Heiss, and Knoell (1966) conducted a comprehensive four part study of doctoral recipients in education. Part I includes questionnaire responses from 818 doctoral recipients in education regarding their background, training and research productivity. Part I contained data on those students who received their degree in the year 1954. Part II includes the same type of information as Part I but analyzes information on 1964 graduates. Part II also includes additional information on graduate school costs to the graduates. Part III offers an analysis of the nature of and the methodology used in the doctoral dissertation by the 1964 graduates. Part IV is a study of the background, personality characteristics, graduate training, and research productivity of thirty-one eminent scholars. Their summary offers recommendations for

reorganization and strengthening of graduate training for research.

Other similar studies of doctor of education graduates were conducted by Broetjes (1966), Brown (1969), Clark (1957), Ehren (1967), Eiken (1966), Hanson (1966), Seagren (1962), and Yarnell (1966).

Time to Get the Doctorate

Length of time to obtain the Ph.D. degree is mentioned in several studies of graduate education. Berelson (1960) discusses several problems occasioned by graduate students during pursuit of the doctorate. He cites data on the duration of doctoral study, noting that there is a significant difference between actual time involved in actively pursueing the doctorate full-time and the actual time elapsed since beginning pursuit of the doctoral degree. Berelson says that there are three ways to look at the length of time to get the doctorate which he feels are all reasonable and useful measures: (1) the elapsed time between receiving the Bachelor's degree and receiving the doctorate, (2) the elapsed time between entering upon graduate study and receiving the degree, and (3) the actual time spent in doing work for the degree.

Another study concerning the length of time required to finish the Ph.D. was conducted by Rosenhaup (1958). He sampled graduate students who entered graduate school at Columbia University from 1940-56. He concluded that, "If the time taken for Ph.D. can be curtailed, graduate schools may be able to produce 10, 20, or even 50 percent more Ph.D.'s each year without increasing library and laboratory facilities, and without markedly increasing the teaching staff."

Improvement of Graduate Education

Improvement of graduate education was discussed by Kirk (1959). In his article, Kirk made four recommendations for the improvement of

graduate education: (1) higher admission standards to insure better prepared students, (2) emphasis on broad principles rather than mastery of a body of knowledge in professional education, (3) review and reform of degree requirements in order to relate them to the vital interests of the students, and (4) continuous study throughout the year.

Mooney (1955) gives a thought provoking analysis of the rationale underlying contemporary graduate education. Mooney considers several assumptions which he considers as detrimental to the integrated development of the graduate student. He finds undue reliance upon an orientation toward external authorities at the expense of the student's individuality and integrity. He said that books, professors, and courses are hurdles rather than opportunities for stimulating inquiry, if the aim of graduate education is to "discover, honor, develop and thereby produce effective instruments of inquiry."

Walters (1967) edited a comprehensive set of essays by thirteen graduate deans. In these essays the deans discussed the current status of graduate education. The concensus of the deans was that the Ph.D. degree is required for college teaching, but the graduate school has failed by its sponsorship of a doctorate oriented toward research with a resultant de-emphasis on teaching ability. Poor undergraduate education is an inevitable consequence. Major problems of the graduate school such as rising enrollments, financial assistance for graduate students, increasing demands on resources, and revolutionary changes in the state of knowledge are discussed at length. The deans concluded that the Ph.D. is torturously slow and riddled with too many uncertainties. They concluded that the basic flaw in graduate education was that the Ph.D. was never clearly defined.

Questionnaire Research

Questionnaire surveys are a commonly used method of conducting certain types of educational research. Sax (1968) gives a good overview of the use of questionnaires in the conduct of educational research. According to Sax, economy is the major advantage of the questionnaire method. The cost of interviewing subjects of a study as opposed to sending them a questionnaire through the mail is prohibitive for most surveys of a very large scale. Sax also indicates the need for preliminary testing of the instrument and a cover letter describing the importance of the study as being important factors to deal with when designing a questionnaire study.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Opinions were sampled from all Ph.D. recipients now living in the United States who received their Ph.D. from the University of Georgia in the period 1966-70 (477 of 510). The degree recipients were asked to indicate their opinions about their graduate school experiences and also about their post-graduate work experiences. Of the 510 Ph.D. graduates who received their degree in the period 1966-70, it was determined that approximately 477 were living in the United States.

Instrument

Opinions in this survey research were obtained by means of a questionnaire. A copy of the instrument may be seen in Appendix A.

The first section of the questionnaire asks the graduates for biographical information including current address, current position, and academic rank (if applicable), along with other biographical information. The second major part of the questionnaire asked for information about certain characteristics of the current employment situation of the graduates. The third section of the questionnaire dealt with graduate school satisfaction. The fourth section of the questionnaire inquired about professional affiliations and honors since graduation. The fifth and last section of the questionnaire included more particular questions about the program of the graduates.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

In the period 1966-1970, the University of Georgia conferred a total of 510 Doctor of Philosophy degrees, to 47 women and 463 men. The purpose of this dissertation was to analyze information obtained from these graduates. The information consisted of basic biographical information, information from the graduates pertaining to their perception of their graduate training, and their post-graduate accomplishments.

Sex Distribution and Major Distribution

Of the 510 Doctor of Philosophy degrees granted by the University of Georgia during the period 1966-70, slightly more than nine percent of the graduates were females and 90.8 percent were males. Of the 340 returned questionnaires in this study, 33 or 9.7 percent were from female graduates and 307 or 90.3 percent were from male graduates. This suggests that the percentage of returns was not biased by the sex of the graduates since an equal ratio (9:1) of males to females answered the questionnaire as were sent the questionnaire.

The distribution of the major fields of the graduates who responded to the questionnaire, along with the distribution by major of the total group receiving their Ph.D. in the period 1966-70, can be seen in Appendix B. Review of the distribution of responses by major seems to indicate no bias in responses by major.

Current Location of the Graduates

The number and percentage of graduates who live in each state and region of the country can be seen in Table 2. Almost one-third, 30.9 percent, of the graduates are now living in the state of Georgia. Table 2 shows that just under 75 percent of the graduates are located in the area generally referred to as the Southern region of the country. University graduates have shown little migration to other areas of the country outside of the South and Southeast. Slightly more than ten percent of the graduates now live in the North and Northeast area. Slightly more than eight percent live in the Midwest, and less than five percent live in the West and Far West area.

Table 2
Present State and Regional Distribution of Ph.D. Graduates

Region	Number	Percent	Region	Number	Percent
South & Southeast			Midwest		
Alabama	13	3.8	Illinois	5	1.5
Arkansas	2	.6	Indiana	3	.9
Florida	21	6.2	Iowa	1	.3
Georgia	105	30.9	Kansas	1	.3
Kentucky	4	1.2	Minnesota	2	.6
Louisiana	9	2.6	Missouri	3	.9
Mississippi	14	4.1	N. Dakota	1	.3
N. Carolina	18	5.3	Ohio	6	1.8
S. Carolina	18	5.3	S. Dakota	3	.9
Tennessee	19	5.9	Wisconsin	3	.9
Virginia	18	5.3	Sub Total	28	8.2
Texas	12	3.5	West & Far West		
Sub Total	253	74.4	Arizona	2	.6
East & Northeast			California	4	1.2
Connecticut	2	.6	Colorado	3	.9
Delaware	1	.3	Oklahoma	4	1.2

Table 2 (con't)

Region	Number	Percent	Region	Number	Percent
Maryland	7	2.1	Utah	1	.3
Massachusetts	2	.6	Washington	2	.6
New Jersey	3	.9	Sub Total	16	4.7
New York	6	1.8	Foreign	4	1.2
Pennsylvania	10	2.9	Unknown	3	.9
Washington D.C.	1	.3			
W. Virginia	4	1.2			
Sub Total	36	10.6	Grand Total	340	100.0

Current Academic Rank or Position

Almost three-fourths of the subjects that responded to the questionnaire hold some level of academic rank at institutions of higher education. Slightly more than one-fourth of the graduates (26.4%) are in positions where there is no academic rank, primarily federal government work and private industry. The majority of the graduates holding academic rank hold the rank of assistant professor, 56.8 percent. Slightly more than 23 percent hold the rank of associate professor, and 12.0 percent hold the rank of full professor. Most of the graduates holding positions with no academic rank are working either as researchers or as research supervisors. Table 3 gives the number and percentages of graduates in academic and non-academic positions.

Table 3
Current Academic and Non-Academic Positions of Graduates

Position	Number of Graduates	Percent of Graduates
Instructor	8	2.4
Assistant Professor	142	41.8
Associate Professor	62	18.2
Professor	30	8.8
Dean or Administrator	8	2.4

Table 3 (con't)

Position	Number of Graduates	Percent of Graduates
Post-Doctorate	4	1.2
Research	51	15.0
Private Practice	3	.9
No Response	32	9.3
Total	340	100.0

First Position After Receiving Doctorate

Two-thirds of the graduates (66.1%) accepted full-time positions in institutions of higher education after receiving the doctorate. The majority of the graduates who accepted positions in institutions of higher education started out at the rank of assistant professor. Of all the graduates going into positions in higher education, 68.4 percent started out at the rank of assistant professor. Of all the graduates that responded to the questionnaire survey, 45.3 percent accepted a position of assistant professor for their first post-doctoral position. The rank of instructor was accepted by 4.7 percent of the graduates, associate professor by 9.7 percent, and full professor by 3.2 percent. Academic administration positions were accepted by 3.2 percent of the graduates as a first position after graduation. More than 20 percent of the graduates accepted either academic research associateships, federal research jobs, or research positions with private industry. Almost ten percent (9.4%) decided on post-doctoral study and less than three percent decided to form their own private business. The number and percentage of graduates listed by the general type of position that they held immediately after receiving the doctorate can be seen in Table 4.

Location of First Position After Doctorate

Most of the graduates accepted their first post-doctoral position in the South and Southeast area of the country (73.9%). Less than ten

percent accepted positions in the North and Northeast area, less than four percent went to the West and Far West area and an even ten percent accepted positions in the Midwest. The distribution of the graduates by the region where they accepted their first post-doctoral position is very similar to the distribution of the graduates by the region of the country where they are currently working. Table 5 gives the state and regional distribution of first post-doctoral positions.

Table 4
First Position After Doctorate

Position	Number of Graduates	Percent of Graduates
Instructor	16	4.7
Assistant Professor	154	45.3
Associate Professor	33	9.7
Professor	11	3.2
Dean or Administrator	11	3.2
Researcher	71	20.9
Post-Doctorate	32	9.4
Private Practice	6	1.8
No Response	6	1.8
Total	340	100.0

Table 5
Location of First Position After Doctorate

Region	Number	Percent	Region	Number	Percent
South & Southeast			Midwest		
Alabama	9	2.7	Illinois	2	.6
Florida	15	4.4	Indiana	5	1.5
Georgia	127	37.3	Michigan	1	.3
Kentucky	3	.9	Minnesota	5	1.5
Louisiana	9	2.7	Missouri	4	1.2
Mississippi	14	4.1	Nebraska	1	.3

Table 5 (con't)

Region	Number	Percent	Region	Number	Percent
N. Carolina	16	4.7	Ohio	8	2.3
S. Carolina	17	5.0	Wisconsin	3	.9
Tennessee	14	4.1	Sub Total	29	8.6
Texas	11	3.2	West & Far West		
Virginia	16	4.7			
Sub Total	251	73.8	Arizona	2	.6
East & Northeast			California	3	.9
Connecticut	2	.6	Colorado	3	.9
Maryland	6	1.8	Hawaii	1	.3
Massachusetts	5	1.5	Oklahoma	2	.6
New Jersey	3	.9			
New York	3	.9	Washington	2	.6
Pennsylvania	8	2.3	Sub Total	13	3.8
West Virginia	4	1.2	Foreign	5	1.5
Sub Total	31	9.2	No Response	11	3.2
			Grand Total	340	100.0

Characteristics of Current Employment

As can be seen in Table 6, more than 50 percent of the respondents to the questionnaire are presently employed by universities, and overall, 77.7 percent of the graduates reported that they were employed by institutions of higher education. The federal government employs 11.2 percent of the graduates, and private industry employs 5.3 percent.

Table 6
Current Place of Employment

Place of Employment	Number of Graduates	Percent of Graduates
University	175	51.5
College	74	21.8
Junior College	15	4.4
Secondary School System	1	.3
Private Industry	18	5.3

Table 6 (con't)

Place of Employment	Number of Graduates	Percent of Graduates
State Government	3	.9
Federal Government	38	11.2
Other	10	2.9
No Response	6	1.8
Total	340	100.0

A majority of those graduates who hold positions in institutions of higher education are associated with public universities (58.3%). The next largest group of graduates in higher education are those associated with public colleges, 17.0 percent, and the third largest group is associated with the private church related colleges, (8.3%). Table 7 gives a bivariate distribution by type of institution and by control of institution for those graduates who are working in the area of higher education.

Most of the graduates have held only one position since receiving their doctorate, (65.8%), and 26.2 percent have held only two positions since receiving their degree. Slightly more than seven percent have held three or four positions, and .9 percent did not indicate the number of positions held since receiving their degree. Table 8 gives the number and percentage of positions held since graduation.

Table 7
Employment of Graduates by Type and Control of Institution

Type Institution	Public	Private	Private	C.R.*	Total
University	155	13	7		175
College	45	7	22		74
Junior College	13	0	2		15
Total	213	20	31		264

*C.R. - Church Related

Table 8
Full-Time Positions Held Since Graduation

Number of Positions	Number of Graduates	Percent of Graduates
One	224	65.8
Two	89	26.2
Three	20	5.9
Four	4	1.2
No Response	3	.9
Total	340	100.0

Almost all of the graduates are fully employed at the present time (97.3%), five are part-time employed, and only three or .9 percent are unemployed. Table 9 lists these figures and percentages.

Table 9
Current Employment Status of Graduates

Status	Number of Graduates	Percent of Graduates
Full-Time	331	97.3
Part-Time	5	1.5
Unemployed	3	.9
No Response	1	.3
Total	340	100.0

Table 10
Distribution of Graduates By Type and Size of Institution*

Enrollment	University		College		Jr. College		Total
	Pub.	Pri.	Pub.	Pri.	Pub.	Pri.	
0 - 1,000	1	0	3	11	3	2	20
1,000 - 2,500	2	3	15	13	9	0	42
2,501 - 5,000	9	3	6	1	0	0	19
5,001 - 7,500	14	0	0	1	1	0	16
7,501 - 10,000	3	0	20	0	0	0	23
10,001 - 15,000	28	5	0	0	0	0	33

Table 10 (con't)

Enrollment	University		College		Jr. College		Total
	Pub.	Pri.	Pub.	Pri.	Pub.	Pri.	
15,000 - 20,000	43	1	0	0	0	0	44
20,001 and above	19	1	0	0	0	0	20
No Response	4	11	1	3	0	0	19
Total	123	24	45	29	13	2	236

* Only those graduates who are currently working in institutions of higher education are included in this table.

As can be seen from Table 10, about 52 percent of the graduates that are working in the area of higher education are working for public universities. Almost two-thirds of that group work in universities with enrollments of over 10,000 students. Almost 42 percent of all graduates working in education work at institutions with enrollments exceeding 10,000 students. Alightly more than one in four of the graduates work in institutions with enrollments of less than 2,500 students. Almost one-fourth of the graduates are working in institutions with enrollments ranging from 2,500 to 10,000.

Since the information relative to the salary of the graduate in their current position was requested by salary ranges, an exact average salary cannot be determined from the information obtained. From Table 11, one can determine the median salary of the graduates to be slightly over $15,000 per year. Salaries ranged from less than $10,000 per year to greater than $25,000 per year. Table 11 shows that better than 60 percent of the graduates were earning annual salaries between $10,000 and $17,000. Slightly more than one in four of the graduates were making a salary between $17,000 and $20,999 per year, and five percent of them were making salaries over $21,000.

Table 11
Salary Ranges for Current Position

Range	Number of Graduates	Percent of Graduates
Less than $10,000	18	5.3
$10,000 - $12,999	75	21.8
$13,000 - $14,999	72	21.2
$15,000 - $16,999	62	18.2
$17,000 - $18,999	54	15.9
$19,000 - $20,999	34	10.0
$21,000 - $22,999	5	1.5
$23,000 - $24,999	2	.6
$25,000 and above	10	2.9
No Response	9	2.6

For the purposes of this study, the graduates were aksed to indicate in the questionnaire the division of their working time into five major areas: (1) administration, (2) teaching, (3) counseling, (4) research, (5) and other professional activities. In the area of administration, 67.5 percent of the subjects responding to the questionnaire indicated that they spent ten percent or less of their time on administrative type work. Only 11.3 percent of the graduates indicated that they spent more than 50 percent of their time on administrative work. The respondents indicated that they spent an average of 15.3 percent of their time on administrative work.

A little over one-third of the graduates, 34.4 percent, indicated that they spend less than ten percent of their time teaching, 63.8 percent spend up to 50 percent of their time teaching, and 36.2 percent spend more than half their time teaching. The graduates spend an average of 40.2 percent of their time teaching.

Most of the graduates, 83.8 percent, spend less than ten percent of their time counseling students or patients, and the other 16.2 percent spend from 11 to 100 percent of their time counseling. An average of 8.0 percent of their time is spent counseling by the graduates.

Almost half, 47.6 percent, of the graduates spend ten percent or less of their time on research, 78.8 percent spend from zero to 50 percent of their time on research, and 21.2 percent spend the majority of their time on research. The graduates spend an average of 30.4 percent of their time on research work.

An average of 6.1 percent of the working time of the graduates is spent on areas of work other than those listed above. These areas include service work, consulting, and other professional activities. Table 12 gives the percentage of time, indicated by the graduates, spent in each of the five major areas of work.

The subjects of this study were asked to indicate the percentage of time they would prefer to spend in the five main areas listed in Table 13. More than 70 percent indicated that they would prefer to spend ten percent or less of their time on administration, and 95.2 percent indicated that they would prefer to spend 50 percent or less of their time on administrative work. Comparing these figures with those of Table 12 indicates that some of the graduates who spend over 50 percent of their time in administration would prefer to spend less than 50 percent of their time in this area of work.

Almost 30 percent of the graduates desire to spend less than ten percent of their time teaching, 72.9 percent indicated a desire to teach less than 50 percent of the time, and 27.1 percent wanted to teach more

Table 12
Division of Actual Working Time in Present Position*

Percent of Time	Administration	Teaching	Counseling	Research	Other
0 - 10	67.5	34.4	83.7	47.6	88.5
11 - 20	10.0	5.6	9.1	10.0	4.7
21 - 30	9.1	5.6	2.4	8.8	3.5
31 - 40	2.4	4.7	1.2	5.8	.6
41 - 50	4.7	13.6	1.2	6.5	.3
51 - 60	1.5	8.6	.3	1.5	.6
61 - 70	1.2	7.6	.6	2.7	.6
71 - 80	2.4	5.0	1.2	4.7	.3
81 - 90	1.5	4.6	.0	7.1	.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Average Percent	15.3	40.2	8.0	30.4	6.1

*Percentages of time.

than half of their working time. In actuality, 42.2 percent of the graduates spend more than 50 percent of their time teaching, so it seems that some prefer to teach a lesser percentage of time.

Very little difference can be seen between the actual time spent counseling by the graduates and the amount of time desired. It seems that very few of the respondents desired a change in the percentage of time they spent counseling.

Over thirty percent of the graduates prefer to spend less than ten percent of their time on research. Almost 70 percent desire from ten to 100 percent of their time to work on research. Comparing this to the actual amount of time that they spend on research the general trend is a preference for more time to spend on research work.

The time desired to be spent doing other professional types of work differs only slightly from that indicated in Table 12 for the actual time spend doing other professional types of work.

Table 13
Division of Desired Working Time In Present Position*

Percent of Time	Administration	Teaching	Counseling	Research	Other
0 - 10	72.6	29.7	81.5	30.3	91.4
11 - 20	9.1	7.4	8.7	12.1	3.2
21 - 30	6.2	11.2	4.1	13.2	2.7
31 - 40	2.6	7.9	1.8	9.7	.0
41 - 50	4.7	16.7	1.2	3.2	.3
51 - 60	.3	10.8	1.2	3.2	.3
61 - 70	2.1	5.6	.3	1.5	.9
71 - 80	2.1	6.2	.9	5.9	.0
81 - 90	.0	2.1	.3	3.2	.3
91 - 100	.3	2.4	.0	5.6	.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Average Percent	12.7	37.1	9.2	35.7	5.3

*Percentages of Time

Graduate School Satisfaction

The graduates were asked to respond to 25 items in the section of the questionnaire entitled, "Graduate School Satisfaction." They were asked to consider each item from two points of view: (1) How useful is this skill or ability to you? Is it constantly used, often used, or seldom used, and (2) Was this skill or ability acquired in graduate school? The information gathered from this series of questions was analyzed first by looking at the usefulness of these skills and abilities as indicated by the graduates. Next the question of whether or not these skills and abilities were acquired in graduate school was analyzed, and then a comparison of the usefulness of these items to whether or not they were acquired in graduate school was analyzed.

Table 14 lists the skills and abilities that appeared on the questionnaire, in a decreasing order of usage. As might be expected from

the nature of the PhD. program, *a thorough understanding of a major field* is the most constantly used skill of the graduates. The skill that is used the least by the graduates is the *reading knowledge of a foreign language.*

The following skills or experiences have been listed as constantly used by more than 50 percent of the graduates: *a thorough understanding of major field; a sense of professional obligation and ethics; ability to work with others in a professional endeavor; ability to teach or train others; skills in lecturing; familiarity with research materials and methods; skills in planning for effective use of time; possession of a satisfying philosophy of life; and acquaintance with professional journals in the field.*

Table 14
Use of Skills and Abilities in Present Position*

Skill or Ability	Constantly Used	Often Used	Seldom Used
A thorough understanding of major field	70.3	22.0	6.2
Sense of professional obligation & ethics	66.2	24.7	6.2
Ability to work with others in a professional endeavor	61.8	30.0	5.3
Ability to teach or train others	59.7	26.2	11.5
Skills in lecturing	53.2	27.3	17.4
Familiarity with research methods & materials	53.2	30.0	14.4
Skills in planning for effective use of time	52.1	37.6	5.9
Possession of a satisfying philosophy of life	51.8	28.2	11.5
Acquaintance with professional journals in field	50.6	38.5	8.8
Ability to organize and present ideas to colleagues	48.8	39.1	9.7

Table 14 (con't)

Skill or Ability	Constantly Used	Often Used	Seldom Used
Ability to organize objectives and course content	46.5	30.9	19.1
Skills and practice in research	45.9	26.2	25.3
Ability to do research or produce artistic creations	42.4	24.7	30.0
Skills in conducting discussions	40.0	39.7	17.6
Skills in delegating work or responsibilities to others	33.8	37.1	25.3
Ability to use a wide range of library resources	33.5	48.8	15.0
Skill in advising students	30.6	37.9	28.5
Ability to appraise the professional contribution of others	29.7	47.9	19.1
Ability to supervise research programs	26.5	26.2	43.8
Knowledge of public affairs	25.6	41.2	30.0
Knowledge in minor field	25.6	45.6	21.5
Ability to work with student groups	20.6	35.6	40.0
Skills in performing demonstrations	19.7	33.2	42.6
Ability to serve as a consultant on problems in major field	18.8	40.6	37.1
Reading knowledge of foreign language	5.6	7.9	84.4

*Percents do not add to 100 since all questions were not answered by all respondants.

Table 15 gives the responses to the question of whether or not the 25 skills and abilities were acquired in graduate school. Eleven of the 25 items were reported as not being acquired in graduate school by more than 50 percent of the graduates. The figures in Table 15 are fairly self explanatory, but, there are a few items that are not obvious. Only 23.8 percent of the graduates indicated that they acquired the *ability to work with student groups* while in graduate school, but more than three-fourths of the graduates are working in the area of higher education.

Less than 15 percent acquired the *skills in delegating work or responsibilities to others* while in graduate school. Slightly more than one-fourth of the graduates gained *skill in advising students.* Less than half learned to *organize objectives and course content.*

On the positive side, more than 85 percent of the graduates report that they have a *familiarity with research materials and methods, have skills and practice in research,* and have *acquired the ability to do research or produce artistic creations.*

Table 15
Skills and Abilities Acquired in Graduate School*

Skill or Ability	Acquired in Graduate School Yes	No
A thorough understanding of major field	85.0	11.2
Sense of professional obligation and ethics	54.7	39.1
Ability to work with others in a professional endeavor	77.6	16.8
Ability to teach or train others	44.1	50.3
Skills in lecturing	42.4	52.3
Familiarity with research materials and methods	87.6	7.4
Skills in planning for effective use of time	35.6	57.6
Possession of a satisfying philosophy of life	22.9	66.8
Acquaintance with professional journals in field	84.7	10.9
Ability to organize and present ideas to colleagues	60.9	34.1
Ability to organize objectives and course content	46.2	47.3
Skills and practice in research	85.9	8.5
Ability to do research or produce artistic creations	85.3	10.0
Skills in conducting discussions	36.8	57.3
Skills in delegating work or responsibilities to others	14.4	79.1
Ability to use a wide range of library resources	77.6	16.8
Skill in advising students	25.9	67.6

Table 15 (con't)

Skill or Ability	Acquired in Graduate School	
	Yes	No
Ability to appraise the professional contributions of others	62.3	31.5
Ability to supervise research programs	58.5	35.0
Knowledge of public affairs	11.5	82.9
Knowledge in minor field	75.0	16.5
Ability to work with student groups	23.8	68.2
Skills in performing demonstrations	35.0	57.6
Ability to serve as a consultant on problems in major field	59.7	33.8
Reading knowledge of foreign language	64.7	30.6

*Percents do not add to 100 since all questions were not answered by all respondents.

One would expect that those skills or abilities that are constantly used by the graduates would have been acquired in graduate school. This is not always the case. Also, sometimes certain skills and abilities are obtained by the graduates while in graduate school and are very seldom used when the graduate leaves the university. The *ability to teach or train others* was constantly used by 59.7 percent of the graduates, but only 44.1 percent of the graduates indicated that they acquired this ability in graduate school. More than half indicated that they constantly use the *skill in planning for effective use of time,* but only 35.6 percent acquired this skill in graduate school. Table 16 gives a comparison of the utilization of the skills and abilities to whether or not they were acquired in graduate school.

Certain of the skills and abilities have been acquired in graduate school by the graduates, but they indicate very little usefulness for them. A notable item is the *reading knowledge of a foreign language,*

for which 64.7 percent acquired the skill, but only 5.6 percent of the graduates indicated that they used this skill constantly. Six out of ten of the graduates acquired the *ability to serve as a consultant on problems in the major field,* but less than two out of ten use this ability very much. Three fourths of the graduates acquired a *knowledge in a minor field,* but only one fourth of them indicated they use this knowledge on a constant basis.

More than three fourths acquired the *ability to use a wide range of library resources* in graduate school, but only one third said they constantly use this ability. Research abilities were generally acquired while in graduate school by most graduates, but *familiarity with research materials and methods* was the only research related item that is constantly used by more than 50 percent of the graduates.

Teacher related items such as *ability to teach or train others,* and *skills in lecturing* are constantly used by 59.7 percent and 53.2 percent of the graduates respectively, but only 44.1 percent and 42.2 percent respectively acquired these skills and abilities in graduate school. Table 16 lists all 25 items along with the percentage who constantly use each item and the percent who acquired the item in graduate school.

When asked the question: *How pleased were you with your total graduate school experience at the University of Georgia?*, 24.7 percent indicated that they were thoroughly satisfied and would choose the University of Georgia if starting graduate work over again. Thirty six percent indicated that they were very satisfied and would choose Georgia again. Thirty percent indicated that they were very satisfied and would

probably choose Georgia again. Eight percent said that they were either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied and would not expect to go to Georgia again if they had it to do over again.

The graduates were asked to consider the items listed in Table 17 from two points of view: (1) Whether or not they had had the experience, and (2) the value of the experience: (VP) Very Profitable, (P) Profitable, or (NP) Not Profitable.

A *strong graduate program* was apparently experience by 80 percent of the graduates, and almost 80 percent of them indicated that their program was either very profitable or profitable.

Table 16
Comparison of Use of Skills to Acquisition of Skills in Graduate School

Skill or Ability	Constantly Used	Acquired
A thorough understanding of major field	70.3	85.0
Sense of professional obligation and ethics	66.2	54.7
Ability to work with others in a professional endeavor	61.8	77.6
Ability to teach or train others	59.7	44.1
Skills in lecturing	53.2	42.4
Familiarity with research materials ads	53.2	87.6
Skills in planning for effective use of time	52.1	35.6
Possession of a satisfying philosophy of life	51.8	22.9
Acquaintance with profess. journals in field	50.6	84.7
Ability to organize and present ideas to colleagues	48.8	60.9
Ability to organize objectives & course content	46.5	46.2
Skills and practice in research	45.9	85.9
Ability to do research or produce artistic creations	42.4	85.3
Skills in conducting discussions	40.0	36.8

Table 16 (con't)

Skill or Ability	Constantly Used	Acquired
Skills in delegating work or responsiblities to others	33.8	14.4
Ability to use a wide range of library resources	33.5	77.6
Skill in advising students	30.6	25.9
Ability to appraise the professional contribution of others	29.7	62.3
Ability to supervise research programs	25.6	58.5
Knowledge of public affairs	25.6	11.5
Knowledge in minor field	25.6	75.0
Ability to work with student groups	20.6	23.8
Skills in performing demonstrations	19.7	35.0
Ability to serve as a consultant on problems in major field	18.8	59.7
Reading knowledge of foreign language	5.6	64.7

Table 17
Experiences of Graduates

Experience	Had Experience			
	VP	P	NP	NR
Strong graduate program	60.9	18.8	.0	20.0
Courses designed for prospective teachers	7.6	11.2	2.4	79.1
Teaching assistantship	41.8	21.2	2.6	34.4
Prior teaching experience	35.3	14.4	2.1	48.5
Courses designed for prospective res.	40.3	28.8	3.2	28.2
Research assistantship	42.3	16.5	1.8	39.7
Prior research experience	38.5	15.3	1.5	44.1

VP - Very Profitable; P - Profitable; NP - Not Profitable; NR - No response due to not having had the experience.

One in five graduates had *courses designed for prospective college teachers*, and almost all of those indicated them to be either very profitable or profitable. As can be induced from Table 17, almost all

the graduates that indicated that they had had one of these seven experiences also felt that the experience was either very profitable or profitable.

Professional Affiliations

The graduates who responded to the questionnaire are active members in average of three professional societies. The range for the number of societies holding active membership in ranges from zero to 18. One graduate indicated that he was an active member in 18 professional societies. Table 18 gives the distribution of the number and percentage of graduates that belong to professional societies.

The majority of the subjects of this study have received no professional honors since graduation. Almost 15 percent have received one honor since graduation, and 9.5 percent of the graduates have received more than one honor since graduation. Table 19 gives the number and percentage of honors received by the graduates.

Seven out of ten of the graduates belong to at least one honorary society. Less than 20 percent belong to more than two honorary societies, and almost 30 percent do not belong to any honorary societies.

Table 18
Graduates Holding Active Membership In Professional Societies

Number of Societies	Number of Graduates	Percent of Graduates
1	45	13.2
2	75	22.1
3	76	22.4
4	51	15.0
5	29	8.5
6	26	7.6
7 or more	16	4.5
Total	318	93.5

Table 19
Professional Honors Received by Georgia Graduates

Number of Honors	Number of Graduates	Percent of Graduates
0	258	75.9
1	50	14.7
2	22	6.5
3	7	2.1
4 or more	3	.9
Total	340	100.0

Publications

Slightly more than five out of ten of the graduates have published at least part of their dissertation. About 13 percent have published their dissertation in its entirety, 17.6 percent have published part of their dissertataion, and 22.1 percent wrote an article from their dissertation. The remaining 47 percent have not published any part of their dissertation.

Very few of the graduates have written books since graduation. Only 5.6 percent of the graduates have authored one or more books. Six of the graduates, 1.8 percent, have written two or more books.

Most of the graduates have not participated in the writing of monographs since only 15 percent indicated that they had written one or more monographs. Eighty-five percent of the graduates indicated that they had written no monographs since graduation.

Most of the graduates indicated that they did not publishe their thesis. Only one in five indicated that he had published his thesis.

The graduates have published an average of 3.4 articles each since graduation with the number of articles written per individual ranging from zero to eighty. Almost 45 percent of the graduates have pub-

lished betwen one and five articles, ten percent have published between six and ten articles, and 8.2 percent have published more than ten articles. Almost four in ten of the graduates have published no articles since graduating.

Other types of publications that the graduates indicated were chapters in books indicated by nine of the respondents, and many of the respondents, mainly extension workers, indicated that they had written pamphlets for the organization for which they were working.

First Post Doctoral Position

When asked how they obtained their first post-doctoral position, four out of ten of the graduates indicated they obtained their position through their own solicitation. One out of five of the graduates obtained their first position through the efforts of their major professor. Only 2.4 percent of the graduates said they obtained their first position through the University of Georgia Placement Office, and .6 percent went through a professional placement service. Almost 15 percent of the graduates returned to former positions upon receipt of the doctorate. Table 20 lists the sources through which the graduates obtained their first post-doctoral position.

Table 20
Sources for First Post-Doctoral Position

Source	Number of Graduates	Percent of Graduates
Major Professor	70	20.6
Own Solicitation	133	39.1
U. Ga. Placement Office	8	2.4
Professional Organization	13	3.9
Placement Service	2	.6
Family	1	.3

Table 20 (con't)

Source	Number of Graduates	Percent of Graduates
Friend	26	7.6
Advertisement	3	.9
Returned to Former Position	49	14.4
Other	35	10.3
Total	340	100.0

About one third of the graduates started out in their first post-doctoral position at a salary of less than $10,000 per year. This is quite low, but, about one tenth of these graduates were doing post-doctoral study. Four out of ten of the graduates obtained salaries between $10,000 and $12,999 for their first position, and one in five receives a salary between $13,000 and $15,999. Less than six percent of the graduates accepted a first position with a salary of over $16,000. Table 21 gives the salary ranges for the first positions of the graduates.

Table 21
Salary Range of First Doctoral Position*

Salary Range	Number of Graduates	Percent of Graduates
Less than $7,000	15	4.4
$7,001 - $9,999	97	28.5
$10,000 - $12,999	134	39.4
$13,000 - $15,999	71	20.9
$16,000 - $18,999	13	3.8
$19,000 or more	7	2.1
Total	337	99.1

*Those graduates who did not respond to this question are not included in in the table. (3 or .9 percent)

Characteristics of Graduate School

This last major section of the questionnaire deals with the question of why the graduates chose to come to the University of Georgia, the length of time it took them to get through their program, and the basic effectiveness of their program. The graduates were also asked to write free form comments about their graduate experience at Georgia.

When the graduates were asked if they had had any difficulities in their professional experience that relate to course deficiencies, two-thirds of the graduates said no and one third answered in the affirmative. More than half of the graduates indicated that courses in their major contributed *greatly* to their professional performance, 42.6 percent indicated that courses in their major contributed adequately, and 44.4 percent said that courses in their major contributed inadequately to their professional performance. When asked to indicate the effectiveness of their total graduate program as preparation for their first position, slightly more than one fourth of the graduates indicated that their preparation was outstanding, two thirds of them indicated an adequate preparation, and less than five percent said they were inadequately prepared.

Two-thirds of the graduates indicated that the time to get the doctorate at the University of Georgia was as they expected when they first came to the University. Slightly over eight percent said that the time to get the degree was less than anticipated, and almost one fourth of the graduates indicated that the time to get the degree was longer than anticipated. Time spent from the beginning of the doctoral program until the conferring of the degree ranged from one to nine

years. More than 85 percent of the graduates spent three or more years working toward the doctorate at the University of Georgia. Less than one fifth of the graduates spent less than three years working on their degree. Table 22 gives the distribution of the number of years elapsed from the beginning of the graduate program to the graduation of the respondents. When asked to give the number of *full-time equivalent* years spent working *directly* on their Ph.D., more than one in five of the graduates indicated that they had spent two or less years working directly toward the degree. Slightly more than three-fourths of the graduates indicated that they spent three or more years working on their degree. Table 23 gives the distribution of Full-time equivalent years spent working directly on the Ph.D. degree by the graduates.

The median number of years between receipt of the bachelor's degree and the doctorate was 6.5 years for those that responded to the questionnaire; the average age for this group is 32.2 years at graduation. More than one third of the graduates indicated less than five years between receipt of the bachelor's degree and receipt of the doctorate. A difference of from six to ten years between the bachelor's and doctorate was indicated by 38.1 percent of the graduates, and the other 27.8 percent of the graduates indicated more than 10 years between receipt of the bachelor's degree and the doctorate. Table 24 gives the distribution of the graduates by years between the bachelor's degree and the doctorate.

Most of the graduates indicated that the University of Georgia was their first choice among those graduate schools that they applied to (71.8%). Only 27.9 percent said that the University of Georgia was not their first choice, and one person did not indicate his preference

either way. The graduates were then asked to rank numerically all relevant reasons for attending U. Ga. from a list of choices that was given to them. Table 25 lists the reasons and the percentage of graduates choosing each reason on his first five choices.

Table 22

Years From Start on Doctorate to Receipt of Degree

Years	Number of Graduates	Percent of Graduates
1	2	.6
2	40	11.8
3	105	30.9
4	102	30.0
5	56	16.5
6	19	5.6
7	9	2.6
8	4	1.2
9	3	.9
Total	340	100.0

Table 23

Full-Time Equivalent Years Working Directly on Degree

Years	Number of Graduates	Percent of Graduates
1	2	.6
2	73	21.5
3	153	45.0
4	79	23.2
5	27	7.9
6	5	1.5
8	1	.3
Total	340	100.0

Table 24
Years Between Receipt of Bachelor's Degree and Doctorate

Years	Number of Graduates	Percent of Graduates
1 - 5	116	34.2
6 - 10	129	38.1
11 - 15	58	16.9
16 - 20	24	7.1
21 - 25	7	2.1
26 - 30	3	.9
No Response	2	.6
Total	340	100.0

Table 25
Reasons for Attending Graduate School at the University of Georgia

Reason for Attending	Preference					
	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth	Total
Location	10.6	16.2	11.5	7.6	5.6	51.5
Prestige of institution	1.5	2.4	2.4	6.7	4.7	17.7
Low cost	2.	6.5	5.6	5.9	4.1	24.7
Reputation of dept.	8.5	11.8	11.2	7.4	3.5	42.4
Financial support from institution	26.2	13.2	11.5	4.7	3.8	59.4
Recommendations of undergraduate teachers	5.6	4.4	6.2	3.8	1.8	21.8
Employment possibilities associated with study there	2.6	3.2	3.2	2.9	1.8	13.7
Special program of interest	9.1	11.5	7.1	3.5	1.8	33.0
Stayed after undergraduate work	5.0	2.9	3.5	1.2	1.2	13.8
Reputation of professor	13.5	9.1	7.1	4.1	2.4	36.2
Recommendation of Georgia graduates	1.2	1.8	1.5	.9	.3	5.4
Recommendation of Ga. Ph.D. graduates	.9	1.5	.9	.6	.3	4.2
Other	7.3	.9	.6	.0	1.2	10.0

When asked to rank all relevant reasons for attending graduate school at the University of Georgia, 26.2 percent of the graduates indicated that *financial support from the institution* was their first reason for attending U. Ga. Almost 60 percent of the graduates indicated that *financial support from the institution* was one of their first five reasons for attending the University. Over 50 percent indicated that *location* of the institution was among their first five reasons for attending U. Ga. Over 40 percent indicated that *reputation of department* was one of their first five reasons. A third of the graduates said a *special program of interest to them* was among the first five reasons they indicated for attending the University. About 36 percent chose Georgia because of the *major professors* with whom they wished to study.

Recommendations from previous University of Georgia graduates was not indicated as a very significant factor in choosing to come to graduate school at the University of Georgia. Less than one in five of the graduates listed *prestige of institution* among their first five reasons for attending the University. Just over one in five graduates indicated that *recommendations of undergraduate teachers* was among their first five reasons for choosing Georgia. *Employment possibilities associated with study there,* and *stayed there after undergraduate work there,* were not listed among the most relevant reasons for attending graduate school at the University of Georgia.

When asked if they were adequately prepared for graduate school, 79.4 percent answered in the affirmative, 18.2 percent indicated that they weren't adequately prepared, and 2.4 percent chose not to answer.

Comparison With Related Research

In the Minnesota study conducted by Alciatore and Eckert (1968), some of the same items were asked of 1954-56 Ph.D. graduates of the

University of Minnesota as were asked of Georgia graduates. The results are not directly comparable because of the time differential and the exact way the questions were presented to the respondents. A few significant points though are quite obvious in both studies. *A thorough understanding of major field* was judged to be constantly used and acquired while in graduate school by both groups. Both groups indicated very little need for a *reading knowledge of a foreign language* while at the same time indicating that the majority of them had acquired this ability in graduate school. *Familiarity with research materials and methods* and *skill in doing research* were both indicated to be constantly used by a greater percentage of the Minnesota graduates, while nearly the same percentage of both groups indicated that they had acquired these in graduate school. A greater percentage of the Georgia graduates indicated that they had acquired *skills in lecturing* in graduate school than did the Minnesota graduates. Twice as many Georgia graduates indicated that they had a *knowledge in a minor field* but the same percentage use it as do the Minnesota graduates.

Written Responses

The subjects of the study were asked in the last question of the questionnaire to take a few minutes of their time to write comments about their feelings on the University of Georgia Graduate School and what the Ph.D. has done for them. The majority of the comments by the graduates can be considered generally positive both towards the Graduate School and toward their individual program. Some of the graduates were extremely critical of the whole graduate program at the University but these amounted to only a very small amount of the respondents. Some of the written responses included specific recommendations for the improve-

ment of existing programs of the Graduate School. Other graduates seemed to enjoy the esthetic value of the degree they received as a result of their doctoral program at the University of Georgia.

The following edited remarks are typical of the comments made by the graduates that can be generally considered as favorable remarks.

> "I feel the training I received in Plant Pathology - Botany-Mycology was excellent and prepared me as well or better than most others starting out at the same rank. I feel the departments were good when I was there and have improved since. I would recommend graduate work in the above areas to prospective graduate students in these areas."

Another said, "I believe that the University of Georgia is one of the up and coming universities in the United States. It has the potential, provided the momentum of the past decade continues. Great advances were made between 1960. . . and 1969."

Another said, "The training I received from the Mathematics Dept. was excellent. I was prepared for research in mathematics and as a consequence, for teaching mathematics. It is impossible to learn a large percentage of the mathematical knowledge in four years. The next best thing was supplied by my training: I know how to learn, and have the desire to learn new mathematics."

Another said, "I spent two years in course work and two years in research and study at the University. Most of the time was spent in the English Department and the library. In my opinion the courses were well organized, the program well balanced, and the faculty superior. I was highly motivated and I found the stimulation, guidance, and materials that I needed. Anything else would have been unsatisfactory. I had not wished to attend Georgia, for I had not expected so much. But I learned humility, tolerance, and a satisfying philosophy of life."

Another commented, "I was well pleased with most of my work at the University. In general I had excellent professors. I could not be very effective in my job today without having had the training received in my Ph.D. program."

Another said, "The greatest thing that I see in the way the Ph.D program is set up at the University of Georgia is the flexibility of the Ph.D. requirements. It is wise to have no specified number of courses or other University wide requirements because these will not apply to all students. Setting the requirements on an individual basis was one of the things I thought was most progressive."

Negative comments were written by some of the graduates. Some are of a specific nature and others are more general. A few of these are listed below.

One graduate said, "Apparently a University of Georgia Ph.D. is not very helpful in finding a good job."

Another said, "The University of Georgia generally lacks competent professors who can teach and guide Ph.D. candidates. In other words, high powered courses are not well covered by professors. Sometimes professors teach undergraduate level topics to Ph.D. students."

A particularly strong negative comment said, "My overall feeling is what a waste. I wish I could have those years back and planned my own porgram with what I know now. . . . My graduate program was characterized by incompetent and immature teachers, in which you went through the motions of the system purely for the degree. Classes were on a high school level. . . .Creativity and innovative ideas were only really tolerated. . . .Memorization was the key to success . . . .I had to teach myself.

Another said, "I have some concern over the centralized, rapidly expanding monster in Athens, and subsequent quality of teaching, and what is learned under such a situation. Essentially, the usual objections to dehumanization - about which little is ever done.

Another negative though constructive comment was, "My major complaint was with language requirements. I think they need revision to fit potential need. The gap should be taken up with additional courses. I also feel more time should be given to teacher training.

Some of the graduates made more personal comments about their graduate experience.

One graduate wrote, "The University of Georgia Graduate School is becoming one of the finest in the country at least in my area of interest. The Ph.D. degree has given me the opportunity to realize my life's ambition."

Another said, "I think the Ph.D. training has prepared me for my work very well. I have no desire for any other type of degree."

Another said, "I actually hate to be so pro-Georgia but it was the most enjoyable experience of my life. I lived on a small farm and my father was a share cropper. I now live in a $40,000 + house and earn $25,000 + per year. I suppose psychology is my life.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Any graduate institution that wants to know the effectiveness of its graduate programs must have some measure of the effect of its programs on the graduates that it produces. With pertinent information from its graduates regarding their training, the graduate school can be in a position to make appropriate adjustments to the graduate program to account for existing needs and deficiencies. This study has attempted to sample the opinions of previous University of Georgia Ph.D. graduates in regards to their perceptions of their graduate training and the influence of this graduate training on their post-doctoral experiences.

Summary

The graduates of the University of Georgia who received their Ph.D. in the period 1966-70 are generally satisfied with their graduate training. The majority of the graduates are now living in the Southern region of the country with 30.9 percent living in Georgia. Almost three-fourths of the graduates hold positions with academic rank, and the majority of these hold the rank of assistant professor. Upon graduation, two-thirds of the graduates accepted positions with institutions of higher education with academic rank. About 78 percent of the graduates are working for institutions of higher education at the present time, the federal government employs 11.2 percent, and private industry employs 5.3 percent. The majority of those in higher education are with

public universities. Most of the graduates are currently working in the same state where they accepted their first post-doctoral position.

Ten percent of the Ph.D. graduates of the period 1966-70 were women and 90 percent were men. Approximately the same percentages of men and women answered the questionnaire.

The median salary for the graduates at the present time is just over $15,000. The median salary for the first position of the graduates was between $11,000 and $12,000.

Two-thirds of the graduates spend less than ten percent of their time in administrative types of work. Almost two-thirds of the graduates spend up to 50 percent of their time teaching, and about 36 percent of them spend more than 50 percent of their time teaching. Over 80 percent spend less than ten percent of their time counseling students or patients. Almost half of them spend less than ten percent of their time on research, and about 79 percent spend 50 percent or less of their time on research. When asked how much time in each of five categories of work they would prefer, about 95 percent indicated a desire to spend less than 50 percent of their time on administrative work, and 70 percent indicated that they would prefer to spend less than ten percent of their time on administrative work. Nearly three-fourths indicated that they would prefer to teach less than 50 percent of the time. Desired time for counseling was not significantly different than actual time involved in counseling. About 30 percent of the graduates wanted to spend less than ten percent of their time on research and over 80 percent indicated that they would prefer 50 percent or less of their time on research.

When asked to respond to a list of 25 items representing skills and abilities often obtained while in graduate school, the following

items were indicated to be used constantly by more than 50 percent of the graduates that responded to the questionnaire:

(1) A thorough understanding of a major field,

(2) Sense of professional obligation and ethics,

(3) Ability to work with others in a professional endeavor,

(4) Ability to teach or train others,

(5) Skills in lecturing,

(6) Familiarity with research materials and methods,

(7) Skills in planning for effective use of time,

(8) Possession of a satisfying philosophy of life, and

(9) Acquaintance with professional journals in the field.

Of the 25 items in the list, the reading knowledge of a foreign language was indicated to be used the least by the graduates.

The graduates were next asked to indicate whether these 25 skills and abilities were acquired while in graduate school. Fourteen of these were indicated to have been acquired in graduate school by more than 50 percent of the graduates. These fourteen items are listed below:

(1) A thorough understanding of major field,

(2) Sense of professional obligation and ethics,

(3) Ability to work with others in a professional endeavor,

(4) Familiarity with research materials and methods,

(5) Acquaintance with professional journals in field,

(6) Ability to organize and present ideas to colleagues,

(7) Skills and practice in research,

(8) Ability to do research or produce artistic creations,

(9) Ability to use a wide range of library resources,

(10) Ability to appraise the professional contribution of others,

(11) Ability to supervise research programs,

(12) Knowledge in minor field,

(13) Ability to serve as a consultant on problems in major field, and

(14) Reading knowledge of foreign language.

When asked if they were satisfied with their graduate program, almost one-fourth of the respondents to the questionnaire indicated that they were thoroughly satisfied and would definitely choose Georgia again. About 36 percent said that they were very satisfied and would choose Georgia again, and 30 percent were satisfied and would probably choose again. Only eight percent indicated dissatisfaction with their graduate program and would go to another graduate school if they had it to do over again.

Given a list of seven common graduate experiences, 80 percent of those answering this question said that they had experienced a strong graduate program and almost all of these indicated that it was either profitable or very profitable. More than 50 percent of the graduates responding to the questionnaire indicated that during their graduate training they had held a teaching assistantship; had prior teaching experience; had a research assistantship; and had prior research experience. Most of the graduates indicated that these experiences were either profitable or very profitable.

The graduates are active members in an average of three professional societies. Three-fourths have received no professional honors since graduation, and seven out of ten of them belong to one or more honorary societies.

More than half of the graduates have published either part or all of their dissertation or written an article from it. Very few have

authored books. They have written and had accepted for publication an average of 3.4 articles apiece.

Nearly 40 percent obtained their first post-doctoral position through their own solicitation, about 21 percent obtained their first position through their major professor, and over 14 percent returned to a former position.

The graduates generally indicated that they have encountered no difficulties related to course deficiencies, their major contributed greatly to their professional performance, and the vast majority indicated that their graduate program prepared them adequately for their first post-doctoral position.

Two-thirds of the graduates took as long to get the degree as they had expected. Only 15 percent of the graduates took less than three years to get their Ph.D., and 85 percent spent three or more years getting the degree. The median number of years elapsed between receipt of the bachelor's degree and the doctorate was 6.5 years.

The University of Georgia was indicated as a first choice of graduate school by 71.8 percent of the graduates. The reason for attending graduate school at Georgia that was indicated most often was financial support from the institution. Location of the institution was another reason for attending the University indicated by a large percentage of the respondents.

Conclusions

(1) The graduates are generally satisfied with their graduate training at the University of Georgia.

(2) Most of the graduates are remaining in the Southern region of the country.

(3) Graduates predominately work in institutions of higher educa-

tion with the majority working in public institutions.

(4) The graduates are earning salaries commensurate with their qualifications, (e.g., University of Georgia teaching faculty members made an average of $13,995 in 1970-71 for 9 months).

(5) The time the graduates spend doing various categories of work in their present position is compatible with their preferences.

(6) The majority of graduates leave the University with a thorough understanding of their major field.

(7) The majority of the graduates received financial assistance from the University through a research or teaching assistantship.

(8) Although the graduates have averaged over three articles published apiece since graduation, they cannot be considered prolific publishers.

(9) The graduates have a minimal use for the foreign language requirement.

(10) Proximity and financial assistance are the primary reasons for the graduates choosing to come to the University.

Recommendations

This study has attempted to sample the opinions of University of Georgia Ph.D. graduates who received their degree in the period 1966-70. No study can sample the opinions of all the graduates on all aspects of their graduate training. Some aspects of the graduate's training have been reviewed in this study through the use of a questionnaire survey. The responses of the graduates were the basis for the recommendations to follow.

(1) The University should consider integrating a teacher training program into the Ph.D. programs so that the graduates will know how to teach and deal with student problems when they accept teaching positions.

(2) The foreign language requirement should only be required of those students whose area of specialty indicates a definite need for this requirement after graduation.

(3) The University of Georgia Graduate School should encourage communication between graduate faculty and graduate students to a greater degree than is currently existing.

(4) The Graduate School and individual departments should take a more active role in the placement of the graduates when they complete their degree.

(5) The Graduate School should undertake a study to determine the primary reasons for the lack of migration of its graduates out of the South.

(6) Additional studies of this nature should be conducted on an inter-institutional basis so that the University can compare its graduates with those of other institutions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alciatore, R. T. and Eckert, R. E. Minnesota Ph.D.'s Evaluate Their Training, Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota, 1968, 80 pp.

Atkinson, Carroll. Pro and Con of the Ph.D., Boston, Mass.: Meador Publishing Co., 1945.

Axelrod, Joseph. Graduate Education for Future College Teachers, Washington: American Council on Education, 1945.

Beaty, Edgar. "A Follow-Up of Teacher Education Graduates as a Basis for Institutional Improvement," Peabody Journal of Education, 46: 298-302, March, 1969.

Berelson, Bernard. Graduate Education in the United States, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1950.

Berelson, Bernard. The Studies of Graduate Education, Proceedings of the Midwest Conference on Graduate Study and Research, 14th Annual Meeting, 1958, pp. 34-48.

Best, J. W. Research in Education, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentiss Hall, 2nd Edition, 1970.

Blegen, Theodore and Cooper, R. M. (Eds.). The Preparation of College Teachers, Washington: American Council on Education Studies, Vol. XIV, July 1950, 186 pp.

Booth, Edward M. A Follow-Up Study of Alumni Who Completed Doctoral Degrees in the College of Education at the University of Georgia, Athens, Ga., 1970, 101 pp. (unpublished dissertation)

Broertjes, Vernon H. "An Appraisal of the Doctoral Programs in Higher Education in the School of Education, Indiana University, Based on a Follow-Up Study of Its Graduates," Dissertation Abstracts, 26:5121, March, 1966.

Brown, Donald D. "A Comparative Study of Doctoral Degrees in Education Conferred by Indiana University as Perceived by a Group of Recipients," Dissertation Abstracts, 29:3316, April, 1969.

Buswell, G. T., McConnell, J. R., Heiss, A. M., and Knoell, D. Training for Educational Research, Cooperative Research Project No. 51074, Berkeley, Calif.: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1966.

Clark, Clarence C. " A Follow-Up of Oklahoma Doctoral Graduates in Education, 1931-1956," Dissertation Abstracts, 18:1359, October, 1957.

Clark, Mildred L. "An Exploratory Study of Graduate Assistantships and an Assessment of the Value of these Assistantships for Beginning College Teaching," Dissertation Abstracts, 24:2798, February, 1964.

Eckelberry, R. H. The Training of College Teachers in the Graduate School, Graduate School of the Ohio State University, Vol. I, July, 1948.

Ehren, Fritz Henry. "Doctoral Graduates in Education: University of Arkansas, 1953-1965," Dissertation Abstracts, 28:140, July, 1957.

Eiken, Everett Harold. "The Doctoral Program in Education at Colorado State College: An Appraisal by the Graduates," Dissertation Abstracts, 26:5153, March, 1966.

Florida State University. A Study of the F.S.U. Doctoral Graduates and Their Reactions to the Doctoral Program at the University, Tallahassee, Florida: F.S.U. Press, 1957.

Garrison, Lloyd L. "A Follow-Up of Doctoral Graduates in Education, University of Missouri," Dissertation Abstracts, 11/03/568.

Hanson, David P. "Doctoral Graduates of the Graduate School of Education, Rutgers, The State University, 1931-1960," Dissertation Abstracts, 27:329 A, August, 1966.

Havemann, E. and West, P. They Went to College: The College in America Today, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1952.

Heiss, Ann M. "Berkeley Doctoral Students Apparise Their Academic Programs," Educational Record, 48:30-44, Winter, 1967.

Hollis, Ernest V. Toward Improving Ph.D. Programs, Washington: American Council on Education, 1945.

Kirk, Grayson. "It Takes a Person too Long to Get an Advanced Degree," Nations Schools, 64:50, July, 1959.

Mitzel, H. E. and Keller, R. J. "A Follow-Up of Minnesota Ph.D.'s: Their General Characteristics," A University Looks at its Program, Eckert, R. E. and Keller, R. J. (Eds.), Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1953, pp. 157-168.

Mooney, Ross L. Evaluating Graduate Education, Harvard Educational Review, Cambridge, Mass., 25:85-94, Spring 1955.

Pace, C. Robert and Milne, Mary. "College Graduates: Highlights From A National Survey," Evaluation Comment, Vol. 3, No. 2, Center for the Study of Evaluation, Los Angeles, Calif.: U.C.L.A., November, 1971.

Rosenhaup, Hans. Graduate Student's Experience at Columbia University, 1940-1956, New York: Columbia University Press, 1958, 129 pp.

Sax, Gilbert. Empirical Foundations of Education Research, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.

Seagren, Alan T. "A Follow-Up Study of the Doctoral Graduates, Teachers, College, University of Nebraska, from 1950 through 1961, Dissertation Abstracts, 23:1990, December, 1962.

Walters, Everett (Ed.). Graduate Education Today, Washington: American Council on Education, 1967.

Whitehead, Thomas H. Unpublished private communication to the Chancellor of the University System of Georgia, 1972.

Whitehead, Thomas H. Unpublished private communication to the Associate to the Provost, University of Georgia, 1972.

Wilson, Kenneth. Of Time and the Doctorate: A Report of an Inquiry Into the Duration of Doctoral Study, Atlanta, Research Monograph No. 9, S.R.E.B., 1965, 212 pp.

Yarnell, Edward A. "An Appraisal of the Doctoral Program in Education Administration at the Ohio State University as Perceived by its Graduates," Dissertation Abstracts, 26:6491, April, 1966.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

For
A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF THE PH.D. GRADUATES
Of the
UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

1966-1970

Nathan R. Keith, Jr.

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA FORM

1. Name _____
   Last First M. I.
2. Any change of last name _____
3. Address _____
   No. of Street City State Zip Code
4. Year started work specifically on Ph.D. _____
5. First position after doctorate _____
6. Location of first position _____
   City State
7. Current position _____
8. Location of current position _____
   City State
9. Current academic rank _____
   (answer if in academic position — otherwise, leave blank)
10. Current position if in a non-academic job _____
    (not related to schools, colleges or universities)

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF THE PH.D. GRADUATES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

1966 – 1970

QUESTIONNAIRE

I. Characteristics of Current Employment

A. Present position is with:

- ☐ A University
- ☐ A College
- ☐ A Junior College
- ☐ A Secondary School System
- ☐ Private Industry
- ☐ State Government
- ☐ Federal Government
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

B. If you are associated with an educationally oriented institution, what type institution?

☐ Public ☐ Private (Non-Church Related) ☐ Private (Church Related)

C. What is the enrollment of the institution? _____

D. What is your annual income range? (Gross salary)

- ☐ Less than $10,000
- ☐ $10,000 – $12,999
- ☐ $13,000 – $14,999
- ☐ $15,000 – $16,999
- ☐ $17,000 – $18,999
- ☐ $19,000 – $20,999
- ☐ $21,000 – $22,999
- ☐ $23,000 – $24,999
- ☐ $25,000 and above

E. How many full-time positions have you held since receiving your doctorate? _____

F. Your current employment status is:

☐ Full-time ☐ Part-time ☐ Unemployed

G. Division of working time: In the left column estimate the percentage of time devoted to the following activities during the past year. In the right column list the percentages you would like to have for these same activities (total equals 100%).

Actual		Desired
____ %	1. Administration (include supervisory work, staff conferences, etc.)	____ %
____ %	2. Teaching (include preparation, grading and advising)	____ %
____ %	3. Counseling and individual case work with patients or students	____ %
____ %	4. Research, scholarly writing, creative work	____ %
____ %	5. Other professional activities not listed above (includes Service and Activism)	____ %

II. Graduate School Satisfaction

A. Consider each item from two points of view: (1) How useful is this skill or ability to you? Is it constantly used, often used or seldom used, and (2) Was this skill or ability acquired in graduate school?

Usefullness in Present Position				Acquired In Graduate School	
Constantly Used	Often Used	Seldom Used		YES	NO
____	____	____	1. A thorough understanding of your major graduate field.	☐	☐
____	____	____	2. Knowledge in minor field.	☐	☐
____	____	____	3. Ability to do research or produce artistic creations.	☐	☐
____	____	____	4. Ability to teach or train others.	☐	☐
____	____	____	5. Reading knowledge of foreign language.	☐	☐
____	____	____	6. Sense of professional obligation and ethics.	☐	☐
____	____	____	7. Ability to work with others in a professional endeavor.	☐	☐
____	____	____	8. Ability to use a wide range of library resources.	☐	☐
____	____	____	9. Acquaintance with professional journals in field.	☐	☐
____	____	____	10. Ability to organize and present ideas to colleagues.	☐	☐
____	____	____	11. Skill in delegating work or responsibilities to others.	☐	☐
____	____	____	12. Ability to appraise the professional contribution of others.	☐	☐
____	____	____	13. Ability to serve as consultant on problems in major field.	☐	☐
____	____	____	14. Possession of a satisfying philosophy of life.	☐	☐
____	____	____	15. Ability to supervise research programs.	☐	☐
____	____	____	16. Knowledge of public affairs.	☐	☐
____	____	____	17. Skills in planning for effective use of time.	☐	☐
____	____	____	18. Skills in lecturing.	☐	☐
____	____	____	19. Skills in conducting discussions.	☐	☐
____	____	____	20. Skills in performing demonstrations.	☐	☐
____	____	____	21. Ability to organize objectives and course content.	☐	☐
____	____	____	22. Familiarity with research materials and methods.	☐	☐
____	____	____	23. Skill and practice in research.	☐	☐
____	____	____	24. Skill in advising students.	☐	☐
____	____	____	25. Ability to work with student groups.	☐	☐

Satisfaction with graduate school experience: How pleased were you with your total graduate school experience at Georgia? (Check one)

- ☐ Thoroughly satisfied. Would definitely choose Georgia if starting graduate work over again.
- ☐ Very satisfied. Would choose Georgia again.
- ☐ Satisfied. Would probably choose Georgia again.
- ☐ Somewhat dissatisfied. Would probably choose another graduate school.
- ☐ Very dissatisfied. Would definitely choose another graduate school.

C. Consider the following items from two points of view: (1) whether or not you had the experience, and (2) the value of the experience: (VP) Very Profitable, (P) Profitable, or (NP) not profitable.

Had Experience Yes	Had Experience No		VALUE VP	VALUE P	VALUE NP
☐	☐	1. Strong graduate program	_____	_____	_____
☐	☐	2. Courses designed for prospective college teachers	_____	_____	_____
☐	☐	3. Teaching assistantship	_____	_____	_____
☐	☐	4. Prior teaching experience	_____	_____	_____
☐	☐	5. Courses designed for prospective researchers	_____	_____	_____
☐	☐	6. Research assistantship	_____	_____	_____
☐	☐	7. Prior research experience	_____	_____	_____

III. Professional Affiliations

A. In how many professional societies are you an active member? _____

B. Please list all professional honors you have received since receiving the doctorate.

_____

_____

_____

C. Please list all honorary societies to which you belong.

_____

_____

_____

IV. Publications

A. Has your dissertation been published? (Beyond microfilm and printed abstract)

☐ Yes in total ☐ Yes in part ☐ Article (from it) ☐ No

B. How many books _____ and monographs _____ have you published including thesis? _____

C How many articles have you published in professional journals since receiving your doctorate?

_____

D. List any other types of professional publications.

_____

_____

V. First Post Doctoral Position

A. How did you get your first position after completing your doctorate? Through:

- ☐ Major professor
- ☐ Own solicitation
- ☐ University of Georgia Placement Office
- ☐ Professional Organization
- ☐ Placement Service
- ☐ Family
- ☐ Friend
- ☐ Advertisement
- ☐ Returned to former position
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

B. What was the annual salary range of your first doctoral position?

- ☐ Less than $7,000
- ☐ $ 7,001 – $ 9,999
- ☐ $10,000 – $12,999
- ☐ $13,000 – $15,999
- ☐ $16,000 – $18,999
- ☐ $19,000 or more

VI. Characteristics of Graduate School

A. Considering your professional experience, have you had any difficulties that relate to course deficiencies in your area?

☐ YES ☐ NO

B. To what extent did courses in the area of your major contribute to your professional performance?

☐ Greatly ☐ Adequately ☐ Inadequately

C. How effective was your total program as preparation for your first position?

☐ Outstanding ☐ Adequate ☐ Inadequate

D. Considering your expectations at the time you initiated the doctoral phase of your graduate work, the time taken to get the doctorate was:

☐ Longer than anticipated ☐ As expected ☐ Less than anticipated

E. Was Georgia your first choice among those graduate schools that you applied to?

☐ YES ☐ NO

F. What was the number of years elapsed between your Bachelor's and Doctor's degree?

_____Years

G. What was the number of elapsed years between your start on graduate work toward the doctorate and the award of the degree?

_____Years

H. Number of years of **full-time equivalent** work spent **directly** involved in securing the degree (including dissertation work)—that is, how long would it really have taken you to get the degree if you had been doing nothing else.

_____Years

I. Why did you decide to attend graduate school at the University of Georgia? Rank numerically all relevant reasons.

_____Location
_____Prestige of institution
_____Low cost
_____Reputation of department
_____Financial support from institution
_____Recommendations of undergraduate teachers
_____Employment possibilities associated with study there
_____Special program of interest to you
_____Stayed there after undergraduate work there
_____Reputation of individual professor
_____Recommendation of Georgia graduate student(s)
_____Recommendation of Georgia Ph.D. graduate (s)
_____Other (specify) _____

J. In your opinion were you adequately prepared for your graduate program?

K. If you could take a few more minutes please write a few lines giving your personal feelings about the University of Georgia Graduate School and what the Ph.D. training has done for you. Any additional comments would be welcomed.

APPENDIX B

Majors of University of Georgia Doctor of Philosophy Graduates
1966-1970

Major Area	Graduates	Respondents to Questionnaire
Agronomy	17	11
Animal Nutrition	4	3
Animal Science	3	1
Art	2	1
Bacteriology	25	21
Biochemistry	10	5
Botany	19	16
Business Administration	16	10
Chemistry	38	29
Comparative Literature	4	3
Counseling & Student Personnel Services	15	6
Economics	5	2
English	16	12
Entomology	17	12
Food Science & Dairy Manufactures	10	5
Forest Resources	23	19
Geography	9	8
History	65	46
Mathematics	25	12
Microbiology	24	12
Pharmacy	5	2
Philosophy	3	2
Physics	9	7
Physiology and Pharmacology	3	3
Plant Pathology and Plant Genetics	7	6
Political Science	13	10
Poultry Science	12	6
Psychology	69	41

Majors of University of Georgia Doctor of Philosophy Graduates
1966-1970

Major Area	Graduates	Responses to Questionnaire
Reading Education	2	1
Romance Languages	3	2
Sociology	12	9
Statistics	6	3
Zoology	21	14
Total	512	340